

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 15, 19-21, 25-27, 30, 34-36, 40-42, and 45-54 were rejected in the Office Action. Claims 1, 10-11, 15, 25-26, 30, 40-41, 46, 50, and 54 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 15, 19-21, 25-27, 30, 34-36, 40-42, and 45-54 remain pending.

Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the Examiner's consideration of Applicant's amendments and arguments submitted in the response dated May 19, 2006, and for the Examiner's withdrawal of the objections to claims 1, 10, 25, 26, and 30, and §112, second paragraph, rejections of claims 10 and 25.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 3-4, 6, 10-11, 15, 20-21, 25-26, 30, 35-36, 40-41, and 45-54 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,178,432 to *Cook et al.* (hereinafter "Cook") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a method comprising:

"receiving by a client device, from a remote server, a plurality of display state definitions defining a plurality of instantiations of a user interface of an application for a plurality of display states of the user interface, wherein (1) at least one of the plurality of instantiations of the user interface corresponds to a multidimensional display state, the at least one instantiation defined by two or more of the plurality of display state definitions, and (2) at least one of the plurality of display state definitions includes a plurality of display cell definitions correspondingly defining a plurality of display cells of a corresponding one of the plurality of instantiations of the user interface;

determining locally by the client device, a current display state of the user interface; and

provisioning by the client device, a current instantiation of said user interface in accordance with one or more of the display state definitions associated with the determined current display state.”

In contrast, Cook simply teaches the provisioning of a user interface as a root file comprised of a plurality of display object descriptions describing display objects of the user interface to be rendered, as well as their behaviors, such as visible or not visible. Thus, each display object has a display state.

In prior Office Actions, the Examiner has noted that the display states of the plurality of objects collectively comprise a “display state of the user interface”, and that the display object definitions defining the objects and their behaviors thus collectively comprise a “display state definition.” In the present Office Action, however, the Examiner now states that each display object definition reads on a display state definition, leading the Examiner to conclude that Cook teaches a “a plurality of display state definitions defining a plurality of instantiations of a user interface of an application for a plurality of display states of the user interface,” as is claimed in claim 1. The implication of such an interpretation, however, forecloses both the possibility of a display state of the user interface defined entirely by one display state definition, and the possibility of a display state definition having a plurality of display cell definitions, as is claimed in amended claim 1.

If “display state definition” is read as “display object definition”, then a display state definition can only define a single graphical component, since Cook teaches each display object definition defining only one graphical component. The display state definitions recited by claim 1, however, define multiple graphical components. Claim 1 now recites that at least one display state definition includes a plurality of display cell definitions. Each display cell definition defines a single graphical component. Thus, amended claim 1 now teaches that at least one of the display state definitions must define a plurality of graphical components. No display object definition of Cook defines a plurality of graphical components. Thus, the display object definitions of Cook simply cannot read on the “display state definitions” recited by amended claim 1.

Thus, if display object definitions do not read on display state definitions, the Examiner is left with the conclusion expressed in prior Office Actions that a display state definition is read upon by the collective display object definitions. That conclusion, however, only allows for one display state definition defining one, collective “display state of the user interface.” Claim 1, however, recites a plurality of display state definitions of a plurality of display states of the user interface.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is patentable over Cook under 35 USC §102(e).

Each of independent, amended claims 10, 11, 15, 25, 26, 30, 40, and 41 includes in substance the same recitations of amended claim 1 discussed above. Thus, for at least the same reasons, independent claims 10, 11, 15, 25, 26, 30, 40, and 41 are patentable over Cook.

Claims 3-4, 6, 20-21, 35-36, and 45-54 depend on claims 1, 11, 15, 26, 30, or 41, incorporating their limitations, respectively. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 3-4, 6, 20-21, 35-36, and 45-54 are patentable over Cook.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 10 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 5, 12, 19, 27, 34, and 42 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Cook and U.S. Patent No. 6,222,537 to *Smith et al.* (hereinafter “Smith”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Smith fails to cure the above discussed deficiencies of Cook. Therefore, amended claims 1, 11, 15, 26, 30, and 41 remain patentable over Cook, even when combined with Smith.

Claims 5, 12, 19, 27, 34, and 42 depend from claims 1, 11, 15, 26, 30, and 41, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, claims 5, 12, 19, 27, 34, and 42 are patentable over Cook and Smith, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

Conclusion

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that remaining claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 15, 19-21, 25-27, 30, 34-36, 40-42, and 45-54 are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: November 1, 2006

by: /Robert C. Peck/
Robert C. Peck
Reg. No.: 56,826

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981